SURVEY OF DAY CARE CENTRES IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES

City of Halifax
Development and Planning Department

March 1989

SURVEY OF DAY CARE CENTRES IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS - MARCH 1989

BACKGROUND:

In response to Council's request for staff to assess the impact of day care centres in residential zones, a survey of neighbours and day care operators was conducted during January 1989. A total of twenty-nine day cares operators were surveyed and 640 questionnaires were sent to area residents. Nineteen operators responded to the survey, as did 33.4% of neighbours. This report summarizes survey results while a complete analysis is provided in Appendix I (Survey of Neighbours) and Appendix II (Survey of Operators). Copies of the survey form are attached as Appendix III.

SURVEY RESULTS:

Survey of Neighbours

In general, residents accepted the presence of day cares in residential zones with 70% holding the opinion that day care was a compatible/acceptable use in the area, and an additional 16% feeling that centres would be more acceptable with greater controls. Only one-third of all respondents stated that they were negatively affected by day care operations, and the incidence of negative impacts increased with proximity to day care.

Neighbours were considerably less tolerant of day care operations in R-1 zones as opposed to R-2 zones, although only 17.3% of the centres surveyed were zoned R-1. Of the residents in R-1 zones, 43.2% complained of negative externalities, only 41.9% felt that day cares were compatible in the area, and 61.0% indicated that existing land use controls for day care centres were inadequate. These figures compare with 30.1% (negative externalities), 77.9% (area compatibility), and 29.8% (adequacy of land use controls) for residents in R-2 zones.

Only 13.8% of surveyed day cares had enrollments of less than 10 children, but neighbours were considerably less affected by those operations with only 5.9% perceiving negative externalities, compared to approximately 35% for larger centres. Conversely, 60% of residents neighbouring small day cares indicated that operations were compatible in the area, while upwards of 76 percent said the same for centres larger than the permitted size.

Some 66.4% of surveyed residents felt day care signs were appropriate in residential areas, while an additional 10.9% thought signs were an attractive addition to the neighbourhood. Survey comments regarding the appropriateness of signs were mixed. Some neighbours maintained the stance that commercial

signs were totally inappropriate in residential zones, while others favored signs for advertising purposes.

One-third of surveyed day cares were identified as having illegal signs (size greater than permitted) although less than 9 percent of all neighbours found them aesthetically displeasing. Only eight percent of residents indicated the need for increased controls on sign size and design.

Traffic and parking were of greatest concern to neighbours, with 35% of residents expressing either some or strong concern. Residents feared that increased traffic during drop-off and pick-up times posed a safety threat for pedestrians and motorists, and that parents often blocked driveways during these times. A lack of on-site parking was often cited thereby creating excess demands for on-street parking and worsening the parent parking problem.

Over 20 percent of neighbours expressed a concern over both day care maintenance and outdoor play areas. Structural disrepair and garbage accumulation were cited as maintenance problems, while noise (children playing) and height and design of fences were concerns about play areas.

Other concerns expressed in neighbour comments include: depreciated property values, lack of notice prior to day care start-up, and the inappropriateness of day cares in residential zones.

Only one-third of neighbourhood residents felt existing land use controls were inadequate for regulating day care operations. Day care size (enrollment) was cited foremost, with 25 percent of respondents indicating a need for additional controls. From 12 to 15 percent of respondents indicated additional controls were required for structural changes, play area location, and the design of fences. Controls for sign design and size were of lesser concern with only 8.8% of residents suggesting stronger controls.

Survey of Operators

Nineteen (65%) of surveyed operators responded to the questionnaire, and fourteen of these were located in R-2 zones.

Survey results indicate that 36.8% of day cares are located in a house not occupied as a residence, and a further 21.1% in each of the operator's home, a residential building with other units occupied as residences, and an institutional building. No centres were in commercial buildings.

Over half (52.6%) of operators selected their day care location based on demand, while 36.8% indicated safety as a location

factor and 21.1 indicated visibility as important. Only 10.5% suggested that costs were lower than in commercial areas.

In general, operators were empathetic towards resident concerns with 42.1% indicating they had consulted with residents to assess neighbourhood compatibility prior to establishing the day care. Only 10.5% had no prior communication with neighbours.

Half (52.6%) of all operators reported receiving comments from neighbouring residents regarding day care operations and, of those, 30% were positive. Resident concerns received by operators were for traffic and parking, depreciated property values, children activities (toys tossed over fences), expansion plans, and increased crime rates (incidence of break-ins). In general, operators have not altered their operations based on resident comments with only one response recorded for changes to each of: size, appearance, children activities, and maintenance.

Operators were evenly split over the appropriateness of land use controls to permit financially viable day cares, with 52.6% disapproving current regulations. Operator concerns were for lot size regulations, sign restrictions, and enrollment limitations.

Only one operator had plans for future expansion, while 42.1% of day cares in residential zones were presently at maximum permitted size.

Prepared by:
Joel Baltzer, Planning Technician

SURVEY OF DAY CARE CENTRES IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES

APPENDIX I

(Survey of Neighbours)

APPENDIX I
(Survey of Neighbours)

DAY CARE CENTRE:

- A total of 214 surveys were returned yielding a response rate of 33.4%. Every day care had at least one return with both Happy Tots Preschool & Nursery topping the list with a 7.5% response rate each. These centres were followed by the Chestnut Street Pre-School Centre (6.5%), Sunshine Preschool (6.5%), Sherwood Park Preschool (5.6%), Happy Hollow Preschool (5.1%), and Play to Learn Day Care and Rockinghorse Academy for Preschoolers (4.7% each). The lowest response rate for an individual centre was Shortt's Day Care (0.5%).

PLAN AREA:

- The proportion of questionnaires sent and subsequent response rate by Plan Area are as follows (sent/response):
  Peninsula (63.4% / 58.4%)
  Mainland North (23.9% / 32.2%)
  Mainland South (12.6% / 9.3%)
  Only for Mainland North did the response rate exceed the proportion of questionnaires sent.

LAND USE ZONING:

- Only 17.3% of the day care centres surveyed are located in R-1 zones, compared to a 21.5% response rate. Alternatively, 82.7% of centres are in R-2 zones with a response rate of 78.5%.

NEGATIVE EXTERNALITIES

- Of day care centres located in R-1 zones, 43.2% of the respondents felt they were negatively affected, while only 30.1 percent felt this way about centres located in R-2 zones.

AREA COMPATIBILITY

- Generally, people are more tolerant of day care centres located in R-2 zones. Some 77.9% of the respondents reporting on centres located in R-2 zones indicated that they were a compatible/acceptable use in the area, compared to 41.9% for centres in R-1 zones.

ADEQUACY OF LAND USE CONTROLS

- Overall, 61.0% of the responses for day care centres located R-1 zones indicated that existing land use controls were inadequate, whereas only 29.8% of those reporting on centres in R-2 zones held this opinion.

DAY CARE SIZE (ENROLLMENT):

- The response rate increased with day care size when compared with the actual distribution of day care centres by size.

SIZE	RESPONSE RATE	ACTUAL DISTRIBUTION
<10 children	8.4%	13.8%
10-25 or 10-35	52.3%	51.7%
>25 or >35	39.3%	34.5%

NEGATIVE EXTERNALITIES

- For day care centres with less than 10 children attending, only 5.9% of the respondents were adversely affected by its operation. This compares with 37.4% for day cares with enrollments greater than ten and up to the permitted number (i.e. 25 in R-1 zones and 35 in R-2 zones). The proportion of respondents claiming to be negatively affected by day care operations drops to 32.5% for centres with enrollments greater than those permitted by the Land Use Bylaw.

AREA COMPATIBILITY

- Contrary to expectations, the proportion of respondents indicating that day care operations were compatible/acceptable in the area increased with day care size (i.e. 60.0% for centres with less than 10 children, 66.4% for centres up to the permitted size, and 76.8% for centres larger than permitted).

ADEQUACY OF LAND USE CONTROLS

- Overall, 31.3% of respondents reporting for centres with less than 10 children felt that existing land use controls were inadequate. This compares to 41.8 percent for centres up to the permitted size, and 30.8% for larger centres.

PROXIMITY CODE:

- Response rate by proximity code (i.e. A=Adjacent, B=Immediate Neighbourhood, C=More Distant) closely reflected the actual distribution of surveys sent.

APPENDIX I
(Survey of Neighbours)

ILLEGAL SIGNAGE:

- Only 34.5% of day cares surveyed had illegal signs (size greater than permitted) compared with a response rate of 30.3% for day cares with illegal signs.

AWARENESS OF DAY CARE CENTRE:

- Almost all respondents were aware of a day care centre in their area (97.2%).

LENGTH OF AWARENESS OF DAY CARE CENTRE:

- Over three-quarters of respondents were aware of the day care operation for quite some time (i.e. since it was established or for as long as the respondent had lived there).

NEGATIVE EXTERNALITIES

- Over 51% reported that they were aware of the day care operation for quite some time and that day care operations presented no negative externalities.

- Alternatively, of the 33.3% stating that they were negatively affected by day care operations, over 75% were aware of the operation for a considerable period of time. Only 24.6% of the negatively affected respondents were aware of the operations for only a short time (i.e. day care established less than two years ago or respondent lived in area for less than two years).

AREA COMPATIBILITY

- Over half (55.1%) of respondents were aware of day care operations for quite some time and reported that day cares were either desirable/compatible or needed/acceptable in the area. Alternatively, of the same group 21.2% believed day care operations were either not acceptable or required more controls.

- Of the respondents stating that day care operations were either compatible or acceptable, 78.9% were aware of the operations for quite some time. Similarly, for those reporting that day cares required more controls or were

unacceptable, 70.5% were aware of the centre for quite some time.

- Some 62.5% of respondents who were aware of day care area for only a short time stated that the day care was compatible or acceptable, whereas 72.2% of respondents with a longer awareness reported the same.

ADEQUACY OF LAND USE CONTROLS

- Only where day care operations had been established for less than two years did the majority feel that existing land use controls were inadequate (64.0%).

PROXIMITY TO DAY CARE CENTRE:

- See notes under Proximity Code above.

NEGATIVE EXTERNALITIES

- The proportion of respondents indicating that they were adversely affected by day care operations increased with proximity to the centre (e.g 43.7% for those living next door versus 28.2% for those living within one block).

AREA COMPATIBILITY

- There was generally a 2/3 to 1/3 split stating that day care operations were compatible/acceptable in the area as opposed to the opinion that they required more controls or were not acceptable. This held true regardless of proximity to the centre.

ADEQUACY OF LAND USE CONTROLS

- The predominance of responses indicating an inadequacy of existing land use controls increased with proximity to day care centres (e.g. 33.9% within one block versus 40.6% for those living next door).

CHILDREN ATTENDING THE NEAREST DAY CARE CENTRE:

- Only 10% of the residents had children attending day cares themselves, and only 2.3% in centres in the area.

APPENDIX I
(Survey of Neighbours)

NEGATIVE EXTERNALITIES

- 80% of those with children attending the subject day care centre were not affected by its operations, compared to 67.9% for those who did not require day care facilities.

AREA COMPATIBILITY

- 76.2% of those with children attending day care (subject property or otherwise) stated that day care was a compatible/acceptable use in the area, compared with 69.2% for those who did not require day care facilities.

ADEQUACY OF LAND USE CONTROLS

- 73.7% of those with children attending day care felt that existing land use controls were adequate, compared with 62.3 percent for those not requiring day care facilities.

SIGN AWARENESS:

- Two-thirds of the respondents were aware that the day care had a sign; however, a no response may have indicated that the day care in fact had no sign rather than the respondent's unawareness.

SIGN ATTRACTIVENESS

- Of the respondents who were aware that the day care centre had a sign, 66.1% indicated that it was appropriate in a residential area and a further 12.5% said it was an attractive addition to the neighbourhood. Only 21.5% indicated that the sign was either too big, too small, or poor quality.

ILLEGAL SIGNAGE

- For day care centres with illegal signage (i.e. larger than the permitted size), only 10.9% of the respondents were unaware that the day care had a sign. This compares to 45.1% for centres with legal signs (or no signs whatsoever). It is interesting to note that for respondents indicating the need for greater controls on sign design and size, only 26.3% said this about centres with illegal signs.

APPENDIX I
(Survey of Neighbours)

NEGATIVE EXTERNALITIES:

- Less than one-third of the residents were adversely affected by day care operations.

CONCERNS:

- The greatest concerns regarding day care operations were for traffic and parking with about 35% of all respondents having either strong or some concern for these factors. The following table summarizes the various concerns:

Concern	Response Rate
Size	21.7%
Appearance	18.9%
Hours of operation	12.4%
Maintenance	20.3%
Play areas	20.3%
Children activities	17.5%
Traffic	35.5%
Parking	34.6%

AREA COMPATIBILITY:

- Overall, 70% thought day care was a compatible/acceptable use in the area, and an additional 16% thought centres would be compatible with more controls. Only 13.2% thought day cares were unacceptable in residential zones.

ADEQUACY OF EXISTING LAND USE CONTROLS:

- Nearly two-thirds of the respondents indicated that existing land use controls were adequate in regulating day care operations.

APPENDIX I
(Survey of Neighbours)

OTHER REQUIRED CONTROLS:

- The following table summarizes the response rate of all respondents of concerns for additional land use controls:

Control	Response Rate
Enrollment	24.4%
Structural changes	15.7%
Play area location	13.4%
Fences (design)	12.4%
Signs (design and size)	8.8%

OTHER COMMENTS:

- Of the respondents providing additional comments, 76.6% were negative in nature. Concerns ranged from noise, traffic signage, location of day care operations in older residential areas, day cares as a permitted use in residential zones, decreased property values, and lack of notification prior to the establishment of a day care in the area.

Day Care Operations:

- Many respondents complained bitterly about noise emitted from day cares, particularly in summer when children played outside. Alternatively, some respondents indicated that day care operations were relatively quiet and that it was a joy to watch children in the area. In general though, complaints about noise outnumbered supporters.

- Several residents complained that the day care property was poorly maintained creating both an eyesore and potential safety hazard for children. Garbage accumulation, structural disrepair of both building and fences, and unkempt landscaping were cited as problems. Alternatively, some residents indicated that the day care centre property was well maintained (Chestnut Street Pre-school Centre was cited several times).

- Enrollment was a concern for some residents, as indicated in the survey results for additional land use controls.

- Residents were concerned that they were not previously notified of a day care being established in their area.

Traffic and Parking:

APPENDIX I
(Survey of Neighbours)

- Several residents complained that increased traffic during drop-off and pick-up times created hazardous situations for vehicular and pedestrian safety. A lack of on-site or immediate on-street parking could aggravate this problem.

- On-site parking requirements were cited as lacking for day care workers thereby creating excess demand for on-street parking.

- Traffic signs cautioning motorists of children in the area were often recommended.

Day Care Signs:

- Many residents complained that commercial signs of any type were inappropriate in residential areas.

- Some respondents favoring day care in residential areas actually suggested that more signs should be placed in the neighbourhood advertising the presence of a day care centre.

Land Use Zoning:

- Many resident declared that day cares should be restricted from residential zones and only permitted in commercial areas. Less stern opinions suggested that day cares could be permitted in residential zones but only in areas with young children and should be restricted from older residential areas.

- Decreased property values resulting from day care operations in the immediate area was a concern.

- Advocates recognize the need for day care and suggest that more space is required. They indicate that centres should be located in residential areas to provide additional safety for children.

SURVEY OF DAY CARE CENTRES IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES

APPENDIX II

(Survey of Operators)

APPENDIX II
(Survey of Operators)

DAY CARE CENTRE:

- Nineteen of twenty-nine operators responded to the survey for a 65% response rate.

PLAN AREA:

- The proportion of questionnaires sent and subsequent response rate by Plan Area are as follows (sent/response):
  Peninsula (24.1% / 16.7%)
  Mainland North (62.1% / 66.7%)
  Mainland South (13.8% / 16.7%)
  For Mainland North the response rate exceeded the proportion of questionnaires sent.

LAND USE ZONING:

- Only one of five centres located in R-1 zones responded, compared to a 70.8% response rate for centres in R-2 zones.

DAY CARE SIZE (ENROLLMENT):

- Approximately 50% of the day care centres within the permitted size responded while 80% of centres exceeding the permitted enrollment responded.

ILLEGAL SIGNAGE:

- One-third (34.5%) of the day cares surveyed had illegal signs, of which 80% responded. Two operators admitted having illegal signs but one indicated the sign was actually erected by the City, while the other claimed the sign was for the children's benefit (child psychology) rather than for advertising purposes.

DAY CARE LOCATION:

- Survey results indicate that 36.8% of day cares are located in a house not occupied as a residence, and a further 21.1% in each of the operator's home, a residential building with other units occupied as residences, and an institutional building. No centres were in commercial buildings.

APPENDIX II
(Survey of Operators)

COMMUNICATION WITH NEIGHBOURS:

- Over 42 percent of operators communicated with neighbours to assess area compatibility, while 26.3% provided information to neighbours, and 31.6% responded to neighbour queries. Only 10.5% said they had no communication with residents prior to start-up.

RESIDENT COMMENTS:

- Only half (52.6%) of all operators reported receiving comments from neighbouring residents regarding day care operations and, of those, 30% were positive.

- Resident concerns received by operators included: traffic and parking, depreciated property values, children activities (toys tossed over fences), expansion plans, and increased crime rates (incidence of break-ins).

- Positive comments from residents included: property maintenance, appreciation for conversion from rooming house to day care, convenience of day care in area from neighbours with children, and the enjoyment of having children nearby.

DAY CARE SIZE

- Of the negative comments received, 57% were for centres that exceeded the permitted enrollments.

ILLEGAL SIGNAGE

- Illegal signs were not a major complaint where only 14.3 percent of the negative comments were for centres with illegal signs.

DAY CARE LOCATION

- Some 71.4% of negative comments were received by operators of centres located in a house that was not occupied as a residence. Alternatively, 75% of positive comments were for centres located in the operator's home.

DAY CARE MODIFICATIONS:

- In general, operators have not altered their operations based on resident comments with only one response recorded

for changes to each of: size, appearance, children activities, and maintenance. Two operators erected new fences in response to complaints of children throwing toys into neighbouring yards. Another operator combatted the parking problem by threatening to expel children of parents who blocked neighbour driveways.

DAY CARE LOCATION DECISIONS:

- Over half (52.6%) of operators selected their day care location based on demand, while 36.8% indicated safety as a location factor and 21.1 indicated visibility as important. Only 10.5% suggested that costs were lower than in commercial areas.

PATRON LOCATION COMMENTS:

- Nearly ninety percent of operators suggested that parents like the neighbourhood or the particular day care centre. Some 47.4% indicated that parents prefer their children near home and 42.1% like their children close to their work.

ADEQUACY OF LAND USE CONTROLS:

- Operators were evenly split over the appropriateness of land use controls to permit financially viable day cares, with 52.6% disapproving current regulations. Some operators felt that lot size regulations were too restrictive considering the small size of Halifax lots, and others suggested that enrollment could be based on building size rather than lot size. Sign size restrictions were cited as prohibitive for effective advertising and suggested that tasteful and pleasing signs can be made larger than 2 square feet. Alternatively, some operators suggested that signs were unnecessary and incompatible in residential areas. One operator complained that the permitted number of children in R-1 zones was limited.

DAY CARE SIZE

- Exactly half of operators complained that land use controls impeded the economic viability of their operation, regardless of day care size.

APPENDIX II
(Survey of Operators)

ILLEGAL SIGNAGE

- Fifty percent of operators indicated that land use controls were inadequate for both centres violating sign regulations and those that did not.

DAY CARE LOCATION

- The adequacy of land use controls to permit economic feasibility was perceived by all operators of centres in institutional buildings but by none of centres in apartment buildings. Operators with centres in houses (own home or otherwise) were evenly split over the adequacy of land use controls.

EXPANSION PLANS:

- Forty-seven percent of all operators had no plans for future expansion, and 42.1% indicated that their centre was already at the maximum permitted size.

OTHER COMMENTS:

- Day care operators recognized the need for increased day care space in Halifax. Almost all operators were empathetic to resident concerns with some making special provisions for neighbourhood children (e.g. neighbourhood children are not required to go on a waiting list) while others made efforts to combat the traffic and parking problems. A further concern of several operators was that occupancy taxes were excessive.

SURVEY OF DAY CARE CENTRES IN RESIDENTIAL ZONES

APPENDIX III

(Survey Questionnaires)

City of Halifax

Office of the Director
Development & Planning Department

13 January 1989

Dear Resident:

This letter is sent to you because you live near a nursery or day care centre. City Council has asked staff to survey public opinion regarding the compatability of day care centres to neighbourhoods like yours. It would be a great help if you would complete the attached questionnaire.

The City presently permits day care centres in all residential areas, with certain controls regarding the minimum size of the lot, the maximum number of children on larger lots, and signage. Day care centres must also conform to specific provincial regulations regarding the size and design of facilities, supervision provided, outdoor play areas, and so forth.

Your response to our survey can help us get a fair and accurate picture of whether existing day care centres are compatible neighbours, what specific problems, if any, exist, and how regulations could be improved for when new day care centres are established.

We also invite you to participate in an open discussion on land use issues related to day care centres. **A PUBLIC MEETING will be held on TUESDAY, 31 JANUARY 1989 AT 7:30 P.M., in the AUDIO-VISUAL ROOM, HALIFAX WEST HIGH SCHOOL, which is located on Dutch Village Road at Alma Crescent in the Fairview area.**

If you have any questions about how to complete the survey form or want any further information, please call Ms. Yvonne Macor, Planner II, at 421-6506. Please return your questionnaire to us in the postage paid envelope or bring it with you to the Public Meeting. **The closing date for survey returns is February 3, 1989.**

Your cooperation will be appreciated; we look forward to meeting with you on January 31st.

Richard J. Matthews
Director of Development
and Planning

YM/lh

Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 1749
Halifax, N.S.

Location:
Third Floor
Duke St. Tower

Telephone
Director (902) 421-6522

Development
Administrator (902) 421-6523

DAY CARE CENTRES IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS

_____
_____

SURVEY OF NEIGHBOURS

Please answer the questions below with your present opinion--do not investigate to confirm information. You may check more than one answer to any question if applicable.

1A. Prior to receiving this survey were you aware that there was a day care centre(s) in your neighbourhood?
__ Yes __ No

1B. How long have you been aware of the day care centre(s)?
__ A short time--it was established less than 2 years ago
__ A short time--I moved here less than 2 years ago
__ Quite some time--since it was established
__ It has been here as long as I have lived here.

2. How close is your house to the nearest day care centre?
__ Next door
__ Within one block
__ One to four blocks away
__ Do not know.

3. Do any of your children attend a day care centre near your home?
__ Yes
__ No, they attend day care elsewhere
__ My children do not need day care
__ I have no children.

4A. Do you recall whether the day care centre has a sign?
__ Yes __ No

4B. If yes, is the sign:
__ An attractive addition to the neighbourhood?
__ Appropriate in a residential area?
__ Too big?
__ Too small?
__ Poor quality?
Comments: _____

_____

5A. Are there any aspects of the day care centre(s') appearance or operations that bother you or that negatively affect the enjoyment of your property or the character of the neighbourhood?
__ Yes __ No

5B. If yes, please indicate your level of concern with regard to the following:

	Strong Concern	Some Concern	No Concern
Size (number of children)	___	___	___
Appearance	___	___	___
Hours of operation	___	___	___
Maintenance	___	___	___
Fenced outdoor play area	___	___	___
Children's activities	___	___	___
Traffic	___	___	___
Parking	___	___	___

Comments: _____

_____

6A. Do you find the activities of the day care centre in your area:

__ Desirable/Compatible?
__ Needed/Acceptable?
__ Acceptable provided there are more controls?
__ Disruptive to the neighbourhood/Not acceptable?

6B. Do you think the existing land use controls for day care centres are adequate? (See attached for existing controls)

__ Yes __ No

6C. If you think more controls are needed, what should be controlled?

__ Maximum number of children permitted
__ Alterations or additions to the building
__ Location of play area
__ Design of fences
__ Size or design of signs

6D. If you have specific reasons for your responses above, or other suggestions, please explain in the space below:

_____

_____

_____

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope by 3 February, 1989, or bring it to the Public Meeting on January 31.

City of Halifax

Office of the Director
Development & Planning Department

13 January 1989

Day Care Centres

Dear Day Care Operator:

Re: Day Care Centre Surveys

City Council has asked staff to survey public opinion regarding the compatibility of day care centres to residential neighbourhoods. We have sent questionnaires to residents of neighbourhoods near such centres. In addition, this separate survey of operators of day care centres has been prepared. Please complete the attached questionnaire so that we may have an accurate cross section of opinion.

The City presently permits day care centres in all residential areas. Concern has been expressed that the present land use regulations do not adequately control the size and impact of day care centres in some R-1 and R-2 zones. Also, some centres do not conform to the signage regulations.

Your response to our survey is very important in helping us to get a fair and accurate picture of whether existing day care centres are compatible neighbours, what specific problems, if any, exist, and how matters could be improved when new day care centres are established. In considering any amendments to the present regulations, we want to ensure that the ability of day care operators to provide adequate services where they are needed will not be jeopardized.

You are also invited to participate in an open discussion on land use issues related to day care centres. **A PUBLIC MEETING will be held on TUESDAY, 31 JANUARY 1989 AT 7:30 P.M., in the AUDIO-VISUAL ROOM, HALIFAX WEST HIGH SCHOOL,** which is located on Dutch Village Road at Alma Crescent in the Fairview area.

If you have any questions about how to complete the survey form or want any further information, please call Ms. Yvonne Macor, Planner II, at 421-6506. Please return your questionnaire to us in the postage paid envelope or bring it with you to the Public Meeting. **The closing date for survey returns is 3 February 1989.**

Your cooperation will be appreciated; we look forward to meeting with you on January 31st.

Richard J. Matthews
Director of Development
and Planning

YM/lh

Mailing Address:
P.O. Box 1749
Halifax, N.S.
B3J - 3A5

Location:
Third Floor
Duke St. Tower
Scotia Square

Telephone
Director (902) 421-6522
Development
Administrator (902) 421-6523
Telex 019-22641

DAY CARE CENTRES IN RESIDENTIAL AREAS _____

SURVEY OF OPERATORS _____

Please answer the questions below with your own opinion. Check more than one answer to any question if applicable.

1. Where is your day care centre located?
   - __ In my home
   - __ In a residential building where other apartments are occupied as residences
   - __ In a house not occupied as a residence
   - __ In an institutional building (church, school)
   - __ In a commercial building.

2. Did you talk or write to the neighbours in the area before establishing this day care centre?
   - __ Yes, to assess market demand
   - __ Yes, to inform them what was happening
   - __ Yes, to get opinions about whether a day care centre would be compatible in the neighbourhood
   - __ Only to a few people who asked questions
   - __ No.

3A. Have you had any comments about any aspect of your operation from neighbouring residents?
   __ Many __ A few __ None

3B. Please explain specific problems/comments:

_____

_____

4. Have you changed your operations or future plans in any way based on comments from neighbours regarding: size of centre___, appearance___, hours of operation___, childrens outdoor activities___, maintenance of property___?
Please explain:

_____

_____

(continue on back of page if you need more space)

5. Why did you choose your present location?
   - __ It is (or was) my home
   - __ Costs were lower here than in a commercial area
   - __ There was a demand for daycare in this neighbourhood
   - __ The location has good visibility for clients.
   - __ The area is safe for children
   - __ Other. Please explain: _____

_____

6. What comments have you had from parents about your location?
   __ They like the neighbourhood or your operation
   __ They prefer to have their children close to their home
   __ They prefer to have their children close to their work
   __ The location is not ideal but it was the only space available, or there is no more convenient centre.

7A. Do you think that the City's regulations are appropriate to allow you to run a financially viable day care operation? (See attached for existing controls)
   __ Yes __ No

7B. What aspects of the regulations would you like to have changed?

_____

_____

_____

8. Do you have any plans to expand the size of your centre at this location?
   __ It is already at maximum permitted size for this location.
   __ Yes, to increase economic viability or profit margin
   __ Yes, to meet demands for more day care spaces
   __ No.

9. If you have any further comments, please use the space below.

_____

_____

_____

Please return the completed questionnaire in the enclosed postage-paid envelope, or bring it to the Public Meeting on January 31.

Summary of Land Use Bylaw Sections Affecting Day Care Centres

Definition

"Day Nursery" --- receives for temporary care or custody --- with or without stated educational purpose, during all or part of the day --- more than ten children not of common parentage, under ten years of age, ---

Parking Provisions

The owners of every building --- used as a day nursery shall --- provide --- parking --- for the employees of such day nursery.

Such accommodation shall consist of one separately accessible parking space --- for every 1,200 square feet of building space used for day nursery purposes ---

Permitted Uses, R-1 and R-2 Zones

R-1 (Single Family) Zone: ---

a day nursery for not more than 25 children;

R-2 (General Residential) Zone: ---

day nursery for not more than 35 children;

Signs

Within the said district, it shall be unlawful to --- erect or maintain any billboard or sign except ---

A sign not exceeding two square feet in size for any day nursery.

Lot Requirements

--- buildings --- used for a day nursery use --- shall comply with the following requirements:

(a) Lot frontage minimum - 60 feet
(b) Lot area minimum - 6,000 square feet
(c) Side yard minimum - 8 feet

Notwithstanding the provisions above ---

day nurseries located in buildings other than dwellings may accommodate (in R-1 Zone) more than 25 children, or (in R-2 Zone) more than 35 children (e.g. a church).

--- day nurseries located in dwellings may accommodate an additional four children for each 1,000 square feet of lot area by which a lot exceeds 6,000 square feet.